

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
:
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :
:
v. : 22-CR-311 (ER)
:
DERRICK TAYLOR, : July 29, 2022
:
Defendant. : Brooklyn, New York
:
-----X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT
BEFORE THE HONORABLE PEGGY KUO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: BREON PEACE, ESQ.
U.S. ATTORNEY
BY: ALEXANDER SOLOMON, ESQ.
ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
271 Cadman Plaza East
Brooklyn, New York 11201

For the Defendant: SABRINA SHROFF, ESQ.
44 Gramercy Park North, #7A
New York, NY 10010

Court Transcriber: ARIA SERVICES, INC.
c/o Elizabeth Barron
274 Hovey Road
Milo, ME 04463
Aria@leinen.net

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,
transcript produced by transcription service

1 THE CLERK: Criminal cause for arraignment
2 on the indictment, U.S.A. v. Derrick Taylor, case
3 number 22-CR-311. We do have the government and the
4 defendant on the phone.

5 First of all, may I have the parties state
6 their name for the record. For the government, who is
7 on the phone?

8 MR. SOLOMON: Good afternoon, this is Alex
9 Solomon for the government.

10 THE CLERK: Thank you.

11 May I have Mr. Taylor state your name for
12 the record, who is also on the phone?

13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Good afternoon, my
14 name is Derrick Taylor.

15 THE CLERK: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

16 And defense counsel, who is present in
17 court.

18 MS. SHROFF: Good afternoon, your Honor. On
19 behalf of Mr. Taylor, who is appearing remotely for
20 this proceeding, Sabrina Shroff.

21 THE CLERK: Thank you.

22 Okay, Judge.

23 THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm
24 looking at the -- hold on a second. I'm looking at the
25 indictment and I'm trying to find the count on which

1 the defendant was indicted.

2 Mr. Solomon, which count was it?

3 MR. SOLOMON: Your Honor, I believe it's the
4 latter counts. It should be Counts 4 and 5 if I've got
5 that right.

6 THE COURT: Obstruction of justice?

7 MR. SOLOMON: Obstruction of justice and
8 false statements.

9 THE COURT: All right, I apologize. I just
10 got a copy of the indictment.

11 MR. SOLOMON: Sure.

12 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Taylor, can you
13 hear me?

14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I can, your Honor.

15 THE COURT: You're not present today. Is
16 your presence in the courtroom being waived? Is your
17 in-person appearance --

18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

19 THE COURT: Ms. Shroff?

20 MS. SHROFF: Yes, your Honor. I discussed
21 with Mr. Taylor the fact that he lives in California.
22 It would be a hardship on him to travel for this
23 proceeding, especially in light of the ongoing Covid
24 issues. He waives his right to a personal appearance
25 and requests that the Court allow him to be present by

1 telephone.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Taylor, is that what
3 you want to do?

4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Okay. The purpose of the
6 proceeding today is to make sure you understand your
7 rights and what you're charged with, and to determine
8 whether you should be released on bail or you should
9 remain on bail, where you've been released after your
10 initial appearance in California, or whether you should
11 be held in jail.

12 You have the right to remain silent. You're
13 not required to make a statement. If you make a
14 statement -- if you've made a statement, you don't need
15 to make any more. If you start to make a statement,
16 you can stop at any time. Any statements you do make
17 can be used against you. You have the right to an
18 attorney. If you can't afford one, an attorney will be
19 appointed for you.

20 I don't see an affidavit -- a financial
21 affidavit.

22 MS. SHROFF: That's correct, your Honor.
23 Mr. Taylor was initially presented in the Central
24 District of California. He filled out a financial
25 affidavit in that district. The Federal Defenders of

1 the Middle District of California, Mr. Cross, was
2 appointed to represent him, which is why we did not
3 fill out a second financial affidavit here.

4 THE COURT: All right.

5 MS. SHROFF: Should the Court want me to,
6 I'm happy to do that at a later time.

7 THE COURT: Since Mr. Taylor was found to be
8 eligible for a court-appointed lawyer in California, I
9 will assume that it's also the same case here. If it
10 turns out that it's something different, I would ask,
11 Ms. Shroff, for you to notify the Court.

12 MS. SHROFF: Yes, your Honor.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Taylor, you've been charged
14 by a grand jury in an indictment with attempt to
15 obstruct justice, obstruction of justice, and making a
16 false statement. Did you get a copy of the indictment?

17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Did you have a chance to talk to
19 your lawyer about it?

20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: Do you understand what you're
22 being charged with?

23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Do you want me to read the
25 charges out loud or do you waive a public reading?

1 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, Mr. Taylor would
2 waive the public reading.

3 THE COURT: How do you plead to the charges,
4 Mr. Taylor, guilty or not guilty?

5 THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.

6 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

7 Were the Rule 5(f) -- was that statement
8 read in California?

9 MS. SHROFF: I believe it was read, your
10 Honor. Additionally, it was filed on the docket, I
11 believe when a codefendant, Mr. Lu (ph), was arraigned
12 last week. I have reviewed that filing with Mr.
13 Taylor. If the Court wants to review it again, that's
14 fine, but it need not should it not wish to.

15 THE COURT: Okay. It's mostly for the
16 government. Well, it's a different governmental lawyer
17 so I think out of an abundance of caution, I'll read it
18 again since it's a different U.S. Attorney's Office.

19 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal
20 Procedure 5(f), I remind the prosecution of its
21 obligation under Brady v. Maryland and its progeny to
22 disclose to the defense all information, whether
23 admissible or not, that is favorable to the defendant,
24 material either to guilt or to punishment, and known to
25 the prosecution. The prosecution must make good-faith

1 efforts to disclose such information to the defense as
2 soon as reasonably possible. I'll be entering a
3 written order that more fully describes this obligation
4 and the possible consequences of failing to meet it,
5 and I direct the prosecution to review and comply with
6 that order.

7 Mr. Solomon, does the prosecution confirm
8 that it understands its obligations and will fulfil
9 them?

10 MR. SOLOMON: Your Honor, we so confirm.

11 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

12 How should we be proceeding today, Ms.
13 Shroff?

14 MS. SHROFF: As far as the defense is
15 concerned, your Honor, I think we're done, but I
16 believe Mr. Solomon would oppose that request.

17 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Solomon, let me hear
18 from you.

19 MR. SOLOMON: Yes, your Honor. As was
20 noted, Mr. Taylor made an initial appearance in the
21 District of California. That was pursuant to a
22 criminal complaint. He was released on an unsecured
23 \$25,000 bond and one of the conditions or conditions
24 missing was that he had to surrender his firearm or
25 firearms. From our perspective that was missing, so

1 we're asking the Court to modify the conditions of his
2 release to raise the amount of the bond to \$100,000.
3 This is commensurate with what the codefendants in the
4 indicted case have been released on. In two cases, the
5 bond amounts are much higher; they're half a million
6 dollars. And secondly, to order him to surrender his
7 firearms.

8 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Shroff, let me
9 hear from you.

10 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I briefed this
11 matter for the Court and I set forth for the Court's
12 perusal why it need not concern itself with what bail
13 conditions were set for other defendants in this
14 matter, nor should the Court be moved by the fact that
15 another codefendant, Mr. Miller, was required to
16 surrender his guns. My client Mr. Taylor is very
17 differently situated even if the Court were to assume
18 that bail should not be individualized and the concerns
19 should be sort of informed by what the defendants have
20 been given as their conditions of release.

21 So if I may just start very briefly, I had
22 asked the government and I requested not having to
23 proceed on this hearing without the Court having the
24 benefit of the transcript in California. The reason I
25 did that is because I had conferred in great detail

1 with Assistant Federal Public Defender Samuel Cross in
2 the district, who had informed me of the following
3 facts:

4 One, that present during that proceeding
5 were two Assistant United States Attorneys. To inform
6 Magistrate Judge McCormick in California, present was
7 Ms. Emily Dean as well as the prosecutor from
8 California. Whether or not Mr. Taylor was brought
9 before the Court on an indictment or a complaint isn't
10 necessarily more informative than what the Court was
11 told. So the Court was told about exactly and
12 precisely these charges, and the Court was told and
13 asked specifically to impose a higher bond amount, and
14 the government sought a gun condition to be imposed.

15 I bring this up because it is not proper for
16 the government to rely on United States v. Salvador
17 because Salvador is factually and in dicta not
18 similarly situated. In Salvador, the judge, now
19 District Court Judge Brown specifically noted in his
20 statement of detention that the reason he could not
21 make the call between release and detention is because
22 the prosecutors in the courtroom could not inform him
23 about the facts that he needed.

24 The issue in that case was whether or not
25 the photographs that were found on that defendant's

1 phone were of such a nature that it would lean the
2 court to impose detention or release. Such was not the
3 case for Mr. Taylor. The government was fully able to
4 give the magistrate judge all of the pertinent
5 information. In fact, the judge actually asked the
6 government, why in God's name are you asking for a
7 higher dollar amount and why would you want to take
8 this man's gun away because the guns are not related to
9 pleasure, he's not charged with a violent felony. In
10 fact, he's not charged with any crime of violence that
11 would implicate either bail or sentence. He is charged
12 with counts that have nothing to do with any violent
13 conduct.

14 The government argued for these conditions
15 and the magistrate judge overruled them. So of course,
16 it's fair for them to come to you. You're a magistrate
17 sitting in the receiving or the charging district. But
18 frankly, this court is not given any more facts than
19 the magistrate judge there. The magistrate judge there
20 knew that there was evidence and that he would be
21 indicted, and that Mr. Taylor had no criminal history,
22 was lawfully employed, and his employment actually
23 requires him to have these registered, licensed guns.

24 Now, Mr. Solomon takes great pains to tell
25 this Court that, you know, Mr. Miller lost the right to

1 have his gun, but Mr. Miller is an ICE agent. He's
2 employed by the Department of Homeland Security. The
3 gun doesn't belong to him, the gun belongs to ICE. He
4 has no right to have a gun anymore because he's
5 arrested and he's suspended from his job.

6 Mr. Taylor is not suspended from his job.
7 Mr. Taylor is very properly employed. Mr. Taylor is
8 compliant with his conditions of release. And most
9 importantly, the supervising district that is
10 supervising Mr. Taylor now, who works in conjunction
11 with Mr. Long from Pretrial Services in New York and
12 who is present in court today, checked with the
13 Pretrial Services officer in California, and the
14 Pretrial Services officer in California expressed no
15 concern whatsoever about Mr. Taylor continuing to have
16 a weapon for his work.

17 And if the Court would just indulge me for
18 one moment, I could tell you that the Pretrial Services
19 officer there, whose name is Teddy Cha, C-h-a, has
20 informed -- and I thank Mr. Long for sending me this
21 email, which says, so it looks like we initially
22 recommended a no-firearms condition but the Court did
23 not determine that condition to be necessary. After
24 the initial assessment of the case and home inspection,
25 I am okay with the conditions set and with the

1 defendant remaining to have his registered firearms
2 locked away at his residence. There does not appear to
3 be any concern at this time but if anything does come
4 up, we will let you know right away. Please do not
5 hesitate to ask us if you have any other questions.

6 Mr. Taylor is employed. His employment
7 depends -- he's employed both as a service processor
8 and as an investigator. For both of these, he requires
9 a registered firearm, which is kept and maintained
10 safely and he complies with all the rules. To take
11 that away from him essentially would leave him
12 unemployed, and it would really impact his ability to
13 litigate and fight this case because a person without a
14 job is simply an idle mind waiting away to rot.

15 This defendant is not similarly situated to
16 Craig Miller. This defendant is not similar situated
17 to any of the other defendants. There is absolutely no
18 reason to change the bail conditions, and we ask the
19 Court not to do so. Thank you.

20 THE COURT: So for Mr. Taylor's employment,
21 is it that he has to carry the gun or that as long as
22 it's in his possession but it could be locked away,
23 that would be okay?

24 MS. SHROFF: Actually, I did discuss exactly
25 that with Mr. Taylor. I am told that when he is hired

1 for a specific job, depending on the nature of the job,
2 it is only then that he uses these registered firearms.
3 So for example, if he's hired to do a specific type of
4 investigation where there is some indication of danger
5 or heightened is when he uses -- uses or carries -- not
6 uses, carries with him the firearm in concern. Other
7 than that, he does not use it. So when he goes to the
8 office every day, he has informed me that he has a safe
9 in which they're locked and they remain locked.

10 I'm very comfortable, if the Court has
11 questions to pose directly to Mr. Taylor, to allowing
12 him to answer them. But Mr. Taylor can also correct me
13 that each one of these weapons is locked in a safe, and
14 I made sure that Pretrial Services in California had
15 done home visits. I also made sure that his wife had
16 spoken with Mr. Long and Mr. Taylor himself has reached
17 out to Mr. Long so that there is supervision on all
18 coasts. Mr. Long of course is present in court today
19 to confirm.

20 THE COURT: Because what I heard you quote
21 from Teddy Cha from Pretrial Services in California is
22 that Pretrial Services is okay with the gun as long as
23 it is locked away. So if your client is carrying the
24 gun, that is no longer what Pretrial Services in
25 California is saying they're okay with.

1 MS. SHROFF: I'm sorry, I did not quite read
2 it that way, your Honor, I apologize. I read it to say
3 that they're okay if he needs it for work.

4 THE COURT: Well, read it to me again
5 because that's what I wrote down.

6 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I don't know the
7 question that was posed to Pretrial.

8 THE COURT: Just read the answer.

9 MS. SHROFF: Okay. The answer is, "I'm okay
10 with the conditions set and the defendant remaining to
11 have his registered firearms locked away at his
12 residence."

13 THE COURT: So they are okay with it being
14 locked away.

15 Yes, Mr. Long.

16 OFFICER LONG: Your Honor, if I could just
17 interject because the question was posed specifically
18 by me to my coworker, as opposed to this work-around.
19 Essentially, what I asked was, as the supervising
20 district, were they okay with Mr. Taylor being in
21 possession of his firearms? It did not make sense for
22 Pretrial in EDNY to argue against something if the
23 supervising district was okay with it. So the response
24 is, "After initial assessment of the case and home
25 inspection, I am okay with the conditions set, which is

1 essentially the idea he is allowed to keep in
2 possession of his weapons and with the defendant
3 remaining to have his registered firearms locked away
4 in his residence."

5 I would -- I guess I would have to discern
6 from that if he's keeping his registered firearms, the
7 question was allowing him to have the firearm for work
8 purposes, not just to have them.

9 THE COURT: Well, I know that in this
10 district, when somebody is in lawful possession of a
11 firearm, they are -- it is standard to say that you may
12 not possess a firearm.

13 OFFICER LONG: Correct.

14 THE COURT: So in those cases, that firearm
15 needs to be surrendered.

16 OFFICER LONG: Correct.

17 THE COURT: But if there were a situation
18 where somebody could keep the firearm in his residence
19 in a locked safe and not surrender it, and if that's
20 what everybody thinks would be okay, then the thing
21 that would be different is that the defendant is not
22 surrendering it. He can keep it but whether he can
23 carry it is a different issue, so that's the part I was
24 unclear about. Did you read what your colleague wrote
25 to me, that the supervising Pretrial Services office is

1 okay with the defendant keeping the gun locked away and
2 also carrying it when he has a job that either requires
3 him to carry it or that he would use it for work?

4 OFFICER LONG: I understand, your Honor. In
5 our district, when a defendant has a registered
6 firearm, it is actually rare for that defendant to
7 maintain that firearm for work purposes.

8 THE COURT: Right.

9 OFFICER LONG: Now, when they have it
10 personally as a registered firearm, since there is no
11 immediate need to keep that, that's when you have them
12 surrender it to the police department or another
13 registered owner. This is an instance where the
14 defendant is indicating that he needs it for work.

15 The question that came up in California was
16 specifically to retain it for work purposes, so I have
17 to infer that if they're okay with it, since this
18 conversation originated under the premise of him
19 keeping it for employment purposes, I would have to
20 read into it that they are okay with him keeping it for
21 employment purposes, which means carrying it for work.

22 THE COURT: Okay, I see.

23 OFFICER LONG: That's again just an
24 inference because the original question was him keeping
25 it for work when he was brought before the magistrate

1 in California.

2 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. This can also
3 be a geographic, cultural difference that in New York,
4 we're very, very strict about people not carrying guns,
5 where --

6 OFFICER LONG: I specifically think this
7 issue -- it actually comes out more to an employment
8 situation. In my time here, I cannot recall any
9 instance where we had a defendant who was permitted to
10 carry their firearm for work purposes.

11 THE COURT: I see.

12 OFFICER LONG: Generally, those who have a
13 registered firearm, they usually have a hold permit.

14 THE COURT: Right.

15 OFFICER LONG: And if the defendant was
16 using it for employment, most likely, that person was
17 suspended as in the other case that we're talking
18 about, Craig Miller, because they had a firearm due to
19 employment.

20 THE COURT: Right.

21 OFFICER LONG: I think this is one of those
22 aberration cases where it coincides.

23 THE COURT: I see, all right, thank you very
24 much.

25 Mr. Solomon, can you tell me if you have a

1 specific concern about Mr. Taylor having a firearm for
2 work purposes?

3 MR. SOLOMON: Yes, and if I could also
4 address several of the issues that Ms. Shroff raised.
5 First of all, our concern is, Ms. Shroff is saying that
6 this defendant needs his firearm for work or he'll be
7 unemployed. By the same token, she was also saying
8 that it's only certain types of jobs that he would need
9 to carry his weapon. That's the first item. The
10 second item is, as alleged in the criminal complaint,
11 there were efforts to tamper with a potential witness
12 in this case. We do have a credible concern about an
13 indicted defendant -- and in my fifteen years in this
14 district, I've never seen an indicted defendant allowed
15 to possess a firearm while on pretrial release.

16 THE COURT: Even for work?

17 MR. SOLOMON: There's a credible concern
18 about --

19 THE COURT: Mr. Solomon?

20 MR. SOLOMON: Excuse me?

21 THE COURT: For work purposes? I think that
22 is the unusual aspect of it that Mr. Long brought up.

23 MR. SOLOMON: Yes, but I also dispute
24 whether this defendant needs a firearm for work. If he
25 has to relinquish certain jobs for work, that is not

1 being unemployed. And further, if this defendant is
2 convicted of these charges -- and the evidence we
3 outlined in our letter is very strong and includes
4 recorded conversations, and he also made false
5 statements to a law enforcement officer, which are
6 easily provable as false. Our concern is that he does
7 not need a firearm for work. He's going to have to
8 relinquish the weapon once he's convicted and he's
9 going to have to figure out how to be a private
10 investigator without having a firearm for the rest of
11 his life.

12 Just turning briefly to the issue of the
13 amount of the bond, it's our position that \$25,000 is
14 simply not enough moral suasion to keep this defendant
15 appearing in court. If he's convicted on both charges,
16 he's facing up to 25 years in prison. The potential
17 financial penalty of \$25,000 is not enough to keep him
18 coming out here.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have anything
20 specific -- any specific concern about Mr. Taylor
21 carrying a gun, any kind of violent behavior you're
22 concerned about?

23 MR. SOLOMON: As I outlined, we have a
24 specific concern that he has attempted to tamper with
25 the witness, and the witness is actually quite scared

1 of future contact from Mr. Taylor. So we would object
2 vigorously to him being allowed to retain a weapon and
3 if your Honor decides he's allowed to continue having a
4 weapon, we would probably appeal this issue to the
5 district judge.

6 THE COURT: Okay, all right. Ms. Shroff,
7 what did you want to say?

8 MS. SHROFF: Thank you. May I just respond
9 briefly? First of all, there is not any credible
10 threat of violence whatsoever because if there were,
11 Mr. Solomon would have been able to give you a specific
12 example. None exists and Mr. Solomon clearly knows
13 this. Mr. Solomon is of course free to appeal, as am
14 I. So the fact that he would appeal, that's fine. We
15 are all playing for the NFL here so we can all go
16 appeal. I don't think that's actually an issue at all
17 before this Court.

18 More importantly, your Honor, this man has
19 been out on bail with these conditions for a month. If
20 ever this man wanted to tamper with someone, take a gun
21 and act inappropriately, that's when he would have done
22 it. He has the guns. They're in his home right now.
23 According to Mr. Solomon, this is such a big concern
24 for him that he did nothing about this for a whole
25 month. There is no concern here. Mr. Taylor is

1 properly employed, as the magistrate judge found in
2 California. He has zero history of violence. Not only
3 has he no history of violence, he has no criminal
4 history whatsoever. This is a sixty-year-old man.
5 We're not talking about somebody who is 25 years old,
6 whose brain is not fully developed. The fact that he
7 may or may not get convicted is for a future date.
8 That is not the issue now. The question is whether or
9 not bail is proper now.

10 But most importantly, your Honor, think
11 about all of the objective people who have told you
12 that this is not a concern to Pretrial Services
13 officers, in magistrate court in California, and of
14 course my arguments to you. This is not a bond of
15 moral suasion. It's not a \$25,000 moral suasion bond,
16 it is a \$25,000 personal recognizance bond. It is not
17 a suasion bond.

18 Mr. Taylor is sixty years old. There was no
19 risk of flight, there was no danger, and not one but
20 two Assistant U.S. Attorneys appeared in court in
21 California to tell another magistrate exactly what
22 they're telling you. Mr. Solomon, I'm happy to go with
23 him to an appeal, but I do believe very firmly that
24 these bail conditions are the least-restrictive ones
25 that are to be imposed under the Bail Reform Act

1 because this is a presumption for release case. This
2 is not a presumption for detention. Thank you.

3 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

4 The issue of the guns first. I am persuaded
5 that Mr. Taylor needs the guns for specific jobs for
6 work, so I will allow him to have the guns for that
7 purpose and that purpose only. I've been told that he
8 is not -- he doesn't need it for every job so what I
9 would like to impose as a further -- just as a
10 condition on this is that he's going to have the guns
11 in his possession only for work, and I would like him
12 to tell the Pretrial Services officer whenever he has a
13 job that requires him to carry the gun.

14 That way, people can keep track of when he's
15 using the gun for legitimate purposes versus any
16 potential illegitimate purpose. And if he's just
17 carrying the gun around because he's going out at night
18 or whatever it is that's not work-related, then that
19 would be a violation. So I'm going to limit his use --
20 I'm going to allow him to have the gun but limit the
21 use to strictly as necessary for work, all right? So
22 that will be my modification to the gun possession.

23 As far as the dollar amount, my
24 understanding is that there are no additional suretors,
25 it's just Mr. Taylor himself. I do think \$25,000 is

1 low for persuading somebody to fly across the country
2 every time he has a court date and make sure that he's
3 here, including for trial, so I am going to raise it to
4 \$100,000. He doesn't have to pay it if he complies
5 with all of the conditions. But if he fails any of
6 these conditions, then he is at risk of having to pay
7 that. And I think that is an important incentive for
8 him to comply with all the conditions, so that's what
9 I'll do.

10 I'll reiterate that he must stay away from
11 all codefendants, victims, and witnesses in this case,
12 except in the presence of counsel. My understanding is
13 that the passport has been surrendered, and Mr. Taylor
14 may not have any further travel documents. Mr. Taylor
15 must stay within the Central District of California and
16 then can travel to New York City and Long Island so
17 that he can face the charges here. He must report to
18 Pretrial Services and be supervised by them as they
19 direct. In addition, he must show up for all of his
20 court appearances. Failure to appear for any court
21 appearance as directed may also result in a bench
22 warrant being issued for his arrest.

23 Mr. Taylor, if you violate any of these
24 terms of release, not only would you have your bond
25 revoked and you could be held in jail pending your

1 trial, but then you'll also be on the hook to the
2 government for \$100,000.

3 Mr. Taylor, do you understand these
4 conditions?

5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Do you agree to abide by them?

7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, since you're here,
9 do you want to sign on behalf of your client that he
10 understands the conditions?

11 MS. SHROFF: Sure.

12 Mr. Taylor, I have your permission to sign
13 for you, correct?

14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, you do.

15 THE COURT: One last condition I forgot to
16 mention. A standard condition, Mr. Taylor, is you may
17 not commit any crimes while you're on release, no
18 state, local, or federal crimes. Understood?

19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Thank you, everyone.

21 Is there anything further from the
22 government?

23 MR. SOLOMON: No, thank you, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: Ms. Shroff, anything further for
25 the defendant?

1 MS. SHROFF: No, thank you, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: All right, thank you.

3 Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

4 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

5 * * * * *

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 I certify that the foregoing is a correct
19 transcript from the electronic sound recording of the
20 proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
21

22
23 
24

25 ELIZABETH BARRON

August 11, 2022